

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 22, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 23 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite and rejected claims 1, 2, 4-7, 13-21 and 26 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Guy (US Patent 6,937,791) in view of Silvergate (4,753,520). The Examiner also indicated that claims 8, 10-12, 22, 24, and 25 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response thereto, the applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 9, 13, 14 and 23. Claim 3 was previously cancelled. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 and 10 remain at issue.

THE 35 USC 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTION

The Applicant has amended claims 9 and 23. These claims are no longer indefinite. The Applicant requests that the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejection be withdrawn.

THE ART REJECTION

Both the Guy and the Silvergate references teach lenses having a transmissive region and a reflective region. With each references, however, the reflective region is used to reflect light toward, not away, from the focal point of the transmissive region.

In Guy for example, the reflective region (14a) forms a total internal reflective (TIR) surface within the body of the lens 14. The reflective surface (14a) is configured to reflect light toward the second focal point F2 of the transmissive region (i.e., lens 26) of the apparatus 10. See specifically column 4, lines 31-38, which recites:

*A first portion 34 of the light rays, which may be termed "high angle" light rays, are reflected by total internal reflection (TIR) from the first (i.e., conically shaped) portion 14a of the solid conic body 14. **Light rays 34 are reflected such that they all are focused at a secondary focal point or input end 18a of the light guide element 18, which coincides with the second focus (F2) of the solid conic body 14.*** (emphasis added in bold and italic)

Silvergate teaches a similar arrangement. In the Silvergate lens, the reflective region 24 reflects the light it receives to the focal point 12 of the lens 26. Column 3 lines 28-35 of Silvergate recites:

Outer reflecting surface 24 is a polynomial curve of revolution about optical axis 16. This curve is determined by the desired maximum rear acceptance angle at point 12, the distance from point 14 to the lens along the optical axis, the distance from the lens surface to point 12 along the optical axis, and is calculated to have a slope *which will reflect light rays between the inner surface 22 and point 12.* (emphasis added in bold and italic)

In contrast, the claims of the present application have been amended to make it clear that the reflective region of the present invention reflects light away from the fiber optic cable (i.e., the focal point of the transmissive region). The cited art therefore teaches away from the present invention. Since the Guy and Silvergate references fail to teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, the present invention, the claims of the present invention are patentable.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

James W. Rose
Reg. No. 34,239

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300